



CITY of THE DALLES

313 COURT STREET
THE DALLES, OREGON 97058

(541) 296-5481 ext. 1125
Planning Department

AGENDA
CITY OF THE DALLES PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
313 COURT SREET
THE DALLES, OREGON 97058
CONDUCTED IN A HANDICAP ACCESSIBLE MEETING ROOM
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2014
6:00 PM

- I. CALL TO ORDER
- II. ROLL CALL
- III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – October 2, 2014
- V. PUBLIC COMMENT (Items not on the Agenda)
- VI. WORK SESSION – Residential Infill Policies
- VII. STAFF COMMENTS
- VIII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
- IX. FUTURE MEETING – November 6, 2014
- X. ADJOURNMENT

CITY OF THE DALLES PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Thursday, October 2, 2014

City Hall Council Chambers

313 Court Street

The Dalles, OR 97058

Conducted in a handicap accessible room

6:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Lavier called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bruce Lavier, Dennis Whitehouse, Sherry DuFault, John Nelson, Chris Zukin

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mark Poppoff, Jeff Stiles

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Planning Director Richard Gassman, City Attorney Gene Parker, City Engineer Dale McCabe, Administrative Secretary Carole Trautman

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

It was moved by Nelson and seconded by Whitehouse to approve the agenda as submitted. The motion carried unanimously; Poppoff and Stiles absent.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

It was moved by Zukin and seconded by DuFault to approve the September 18, 2014 minutes as submitted. Lavier, DuFault, Nelson and Zukin voted in favor, Whitehouse abstained; Poppoff and Stiles absent. The motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Garry Peterson, 2604 Old Dufur Road, The Dalles, Oregon, stated that he submitted a building permit application and signed a Delayed Development Agreement (DDA) in May of this year because he did not wish to wait until potential changes to the residential infill policies were determined to develop his property. Mr. Peterson asked if the terms of his existing DDA be reviewed, in light of potential changes to residential infill street improvement requirements. For example, under the terms of his DDA, he is responsible for engineering costs for curb and sidewalk, and the City has proposed to do the engineering for street improvements for residential infill. City Attorney Parker stated these concerns were not brought up by Mr. Peterson when he signed the DDA in May, but if staff was directed to review the DDA, it could be done. Director Gassman indicated the City Council was the governing jurisdiction for City agreements. Mr. Peterson asked if the engineering payment could be delayed under the circumstances. After further discussion the Commission advised Mr. Peterson to confer with Director Gassman and possibly take his requests before City Council.

WORK SESSION:

Director Gassman presented highlights of his staff memorandum. He pointed out that City engineers Dale McCabe and Todd Stephens prepared some preliminary design guidelines for the residential infill network grid streets. Gassman reported that after reviewing the proposed street grid, staff recommended removing three streets as follows: West Sixth, Webber Street and Cherry Heights. These streets had very few, if any, residences on them, and it would make for a cleaner grid. Discussion followed on whether or not to leave those streets in, and it was the general consensus of the Commission to leave those streets in the street grid network, but in a different color. By leaving the streets in, it would define the entire main grid of streets across the City, even though the aforementioned streets were not considered predominantly residential streets.

Staff suggested adding two streets as follows: East Tenth Street from Kelly to Thompson, and a section of East 19th that has a substantial amount of foot traffic to and from Dry Hollow School. Zukin stated the Planning Commission's overall philosophy was to minimize the route. Nelson asked if removing West 6th Street would have an impact on state requirements such as bicycle routes, etc. Director Gassman said it would not if, in the recommendation, it was made very clear the grid was for residential infill only. Whitehouse asked if it would change the Transportation System Plan (TSP). Gassman advised that the City received a grant for the TSP, so the City would take into account the results of this work. Lavier felt the streets should be shown, because all of those streets provide access into the residential areas. After further discussion, it was the general consensus of the Commission to leave the grid streets on the network map, but color West Sixth, Webber and Cherry Heights red, and the residential streets blue.

It was moved by DuFault and seconded by Nelson to include the East 10th Street from Kelly to Thompson Streets in the grid street network. Two voted in favor, three opposed, the motion did not carry.

It was moved by Nelson and seconded by Whitehouse to include the aforementioned portion of East 19th Street in the grid street network. The motion carried unanimously.

Director Gassman brought up the issue of which residential grid streets would be ready for improvements as development occurred. Improvements were defined as storm water, and a basic street design from either existing street conditions or a City staff design that would be implemented with options. Gassman said all of the streets on the west side (Chenowith, Hostetler, Snipes, W. 10th, Mt. Hood, Trevitt, Union, Scenic, and Kelly) were either already fully improved, or ready to be improved as development occurred. Staff proposed that the standard be that if someone developed (not at the time of a minor partition, but by adding a house), that person would bring the street up to the proposed street design standard. Gassman pointed out that in doing so, islands would be created; but it would be a "cleaner" process to put improvements in at the time of development than to have the developer sign a Delayed Development Agreement (DDA). Gassman stated that a few streets were not ready, such as Thompson, Fremont up to East Knoll Drive, and a portion of Old Dufur Road. Residential infill development on those streets would require a DDA, because there was no other option.

He said there were some portions of West 10th Street where topographical conditions would require the street to be widened 8-10 feet for on-street parking, which could incur extensive excavation expenses. Some residents, he said, already had on-street parking, and adjacent properties did not. In those cases, staff recommended leaving it up to the developing property owner whether or not on-street parking was installed. Gassman said some streets in that area may need widening, mostly for bike lanes. It

was the general consensus of the Commission to give the developing property owner the option for on-street parking.

Director Gassman redirected the Commission back to staff's recommendation of requiring street improvements at the time of development. He said it made sense for improvements to be installed at that time, even though it created "islands." The other option of the property owner signing a DDA had its drawbacks in that as the course of time lengthened, the DDA often was not in the forefront of the property owner's mind. Zukin and Whitehouse indicated they were in favor of a DDA with a cap and a sunset clause. Zukin suggested recommending various options to the City Council for their consideration, and definitions for "cap" and "sunset clause" should be included in the recommendation. Nelson stated he was in favor of recommending different options to the City Council. The Commission discussed four options: 1) property owner installs improvements at the time of development; 2) property owner signs a DDA with a cap and sunset clause; 3) property owner elects to pay into the fund property; and 4) property owner builds, and the City improves the streets. After further discussion, it was the general consensus of the Commission to recommend that the property owner may choose one of four options. Gassman stated there could be some situations where the City may not want to give the property owner options if adjacent property owners have installed improvements. In a case where a property owner is creating an island, he/she could be given the options.

Director Gassman gave an overview of the preliminary street designs composed by the Public Works staff. City Engineer McCabe gave an explanation of the process of how the street designs were created. Zukin said he thought the designs were good, because the developing property owner would be informed on what was required at the time of development. Gassman said staff would need to assess each development site so that the best street improvement design could be determined. McCabe suggested that the Commissioners review the cross section aerials developed by staff in order to review the proposed street improvement design and then make recommendations to City Council. Whitehouse asked if the streets would be narrower. McCabe said the streets would either remain the same or be widened.

It was the consensus of the Commission to call a special work session bus tour to view the street grid network in relation to the proposed street improvement designs; Secretary Trautman will poll Commissioners and set up a day and time.

Director Gassman reported there were other unanswered questions for the Commission to discuss at a future meeting.

- What are the standards for new streets? With the occurrence of serial minor partitioning, sometimes new streets are created.
- How will storm drains be installed in a new serial development?
- Waivers – City Council directed staff to revoke all Waivers of Remonstrance. Does the Planning Commission want to recommend that if there are Waivers on any of the residential infill grid streets, those Waivers should not be removed? Staff was directed to identify whether or not there were any existing Waivers of Remonstrance on the proposed grid street network.
- With the proposed street improvement designs, questions arise regarding driveway installation standards. What should those standards be?

STAFF COMMENTS:

Director Gassman stated that another residential infill work session should be scheduled for October 16 to address the previous questions and issues and to define the DDA cap and sunset clause. He will be presenting a status report at the October 27 City Council meeting.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:

Whitehouse advised that he attended a wrap up meeting for the Rowena fire. One discussion item was identifying future locations for fire camps and facilities. Fire personnel commented that the new armory was not an option, because it was too far away for a quick response time.

NEXT MEETING:

October 16, 2014

ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Lavier adjourned the meeting at 7:56 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Administrative Secretary Carole Trautman

Bruce Lavier, Chairman